

### **REMARKS**

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner in the Office Action Summary but an explanation was not provided in the Detailed Action. Applicants filed on July 17, 2001 a Letter to the Official Draftsperson enclosing 9 sheets of formal drawings in response to the Notice to File Corrected Application Papers mailed May 23, 2001. Applicants would appreciate an opportunity to respond to a description of the Drawings Objection.

Claim 8-13, 18-21, and 27-30 have been deleted. Claims 1, 14, and 22, the only independent claims, have been amended to specify that the printing locations are remote. New claims 31, 32, and 33 have been added to depend from each of the independent claims 1, 14, and 22 to take care of the situation that the remote printing locations can print different photo products.

Claims 1-2, 6-9, 13 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent 6,618,051) in view of Safai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,469).

Claim 1 is believed to be representative of the claims. It includes a method of ordering a photo product to be printed at a selected location and delivered to a designee. The user communicates with a service provider and provides an identification of the designated location where the selected photo product is to be delivered. This is done after the user has selected the photo product and provided the location where the designee is located. The photo product is printed at the selected remote designation and the photo product is delivered to the designee.

Turning first to Edwards et al. which discloses a system for creating and displaying halographic images. As the Examiner states, Edwards et al. do not disclose providing an identification of the designee's location where the selected photo product is to be delivered or the service provider automatically selecting from a plurality of printing locations. Edwards et al. disclose only a single printing location for the service provider. The Examiner's attention is called to the advantages set forth in page 3 of the specification. This series discusses why it is important to print products at a selected particular printing location in order to minimize, for example, shipping costs and time. Applicants can find no motivation in Edwards et al. for the present invention.

Turning now to Safai et al., they disclose a digital camera that can send images to designated destinations over a communication network. When the destination is a postal address, images are automatically routed to a central server where they are printed, packaged, and sent to the destination. However, Safai et al. disclose only a central server with a single printer 612 in FIG. 6. Moreover, Safai et al. is not concerned with ordering a selected photo product from a plurality of photo products. Rather, when the destination is a postal address, a hardcopy print is produced and mailed from a single location. The user of the digital camera can not select from among a plurality of different hardcopy print sizes. Furthermore, because there is only one printing location, the destination provided by the user is not used to automatically select from a plurality of printing locations, a particular printing location.

Applicants fail to see where the combination of Edwards et al. and Safai et al. combine to disclose or suggest any motivation for the features of claim 1 discussed above, since each of them show only a single printing location. Claim 1 is believed to define unobvious subject matter.

Claims 3-5, 10-12 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent 6,618,051) in view of Safai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,469) and further in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,285,777). Claims 14-21 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent 6,618,051) in view of Safai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,469) and further in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,285,777).

Edwards et al. and Safai et al. have been discussed above with respect to the independent claims in this case. Kanevsky et al. set forth a communication system that permits the user to send an internet message to an addressee via postal mail. The post office forwards the message via email to the internet post office that is closest to the addressee where the message is printed on paper, put in an envelope, and sent to the addressee via local mail. Applicants note there is no selection of a particular photo product from a plurality of photo products and no motivation for the present invention. Even assuming Kanevsky et al. could be combined with any of the cited art, Applicants fail to find any

motivation for the present invention. Accordingly, it is believed that all of the independent claims in this case define unobvious subject matter.

It should be noted by the Examiner that independent claim 14 has the further feature in that the service provider provides a representation of the photo product the user before the user approves the ordering of such photo products. Clearly, this feature is not shown in any of the cited references. Independent claim 22 sets forth how the photo product is delivered to the designee by printing shipping labels and using such labels to deliver a shipping containers containing the photo products to designees.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/JMD  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone 585-477-4653  
Facsimile 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.